

REMARKS

The Office Action dated October 21, 2004, has been received and reviewed.

Claims 1-39 and 41-67 are currently pending in the above-referenced application. Of these, claims 1-13, 17-26, 31-33, 37-39, and 42-44 have been considered and stand rejected. Claims 14-16, 27-30, 34-36, 41, and 45-67 have been withdrawn from consideration.

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-13, 17-26, 31-33, 37-39, and 42-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The standard for establishing and maintaining a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is set forth in M.P.E.P. § 706.02(j), which provides:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Nakanishi

Claims 1-10, 17, 19-26, 33, 37-39, and 42-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for reciting subject matter which is assertedly unpatentable over that taught in U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0013643 of Nakanishi et al. (hereinafter "Nakanishi").

Independent claim 1 is directed to a semiconductor device that includes a semiconductor die and a dielectric spacer layer formed on and secured to at least a portion of a surface of the semiconductor die. The dielectric spacer layer of independent claim 1 includes "voids communicating with a lateral periphery thereof."

With respect to dielectric spacer layers, the teachings of Nakanishi are limited to a polyimide spacer 24 (paragraph [0078]) that is "disposed along the periphery of the region where

the semiconductor chips 1 and 2 are stacked” to provide for “a high level of accuracy in the balance of the intervals between the semiconductor chips 1 and 2” (paragraph [0080]). Stated another way, the polyimide spacer 24 of Nakanishi surrounds the entire center of one of the semiconductor dice 1 and, thus, lacks any voids that communicate with a lateral periphery of the polyimide spacer 24.

As such, Nakanishi does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1, as would be required to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claim 1 and, thus, to maintain the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 1.

Each of claims 2-10 and 17 is allowable, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from claim 1, which is allowable.

Claim 2 is further allowable since Nakanishi lacks any teaching or suggestion that the polyimide spacer 24 thereof may include a plurality of laterally discrete spacers.

Claim 5 is also allowable since Nakanishi lacks any teaching or suggestion that the polyimide spacer 24 thereof may have a thickness that exceeds a height that at least one intermediate conductive element (*e.g.*, bond wires 8a, 8b of FIG. 9) protrudes above the active surface of a semiconductor device 2, 3 to which the polyimide spacer is secured.

Claim 8 is additionally allowable because Nakanishi teach or suggest that the polyimide spacer 24 thereof comprises a pattern.

Claim 9 is further allowable since Nakanishi lacks any teaching or suggestion that the polyimide spacer 24 thereof comprises randomly arranged features.

Claim 17 is also allowable because Nakanishi does not teach or suggest that adhesive material may be present on an exposed surface of the polyimide spacer 24.

Independent claim 19, as amended and presented herein, is drawn to a semiconductor device assembly that includes, among other things, a nonconfluent spacer layer that spaces an active surface of a first semiconductor device apart from a back side of a second semiconductor device.

In contrast to the subject matter recited in independent claim 19, the teachings of Nakanishi are limited to assemblies with spacer layers that separate active surfaces of

semiconductor devices apart from one another. *See, e.g.*, Fig. 9; paragraphs [0077] and [0047]. As Nakanishi does not teach or suggest an assembly in which a spacer layer is configured to space an active surface of a first semiconductor device apart from a back side of a second semiconductor device, Nakanishi cannot be relied upon to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against independent claim 19.

Therefore, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the subject matter recited in independent claim 19 is allowable over the subject matter taught in Nakanishi.

Claims 20-26, 33, 37-39, and 42-44 are each allowable, among other reasons, for depending directly or indirectly from claim 19, which is allowable.

Claim 20 is also allowable since Nakanishi neither teaches nor suggests that the polyimide spacer 24 thereof includes at least one void that communicates with a lateral periphery of the polyimide spacer 24.

Claim 21, which depends from claim 20, is additionally allowable because Nakanishi does not teach or suggest that the polyimide spacer 24 includes a void that facilitates introduction of adhesive material between first and second semiconductor devices.

Claim 22 is further allowable since Nakanishi includes no teaching or suggestion that the polyimide spacer 24 thereof includes a plurality of laterally discrete spacers.

Claim 24 is additionally allowable because Nakanishi does not teach or suggest an assembly in which an intermediate conductive element is located at least partially between first and second semiconductor devices that are spaced apart from one another by the polyimide spacer 24 disclosed therein.

Claim 25 depends from claim 24 and is also allowable since Nakanishi lacks any teaching or suggestion that the polyimide spacer 24 thereof may space first and second semiconductor devices apart from one another a distance that exceeds a height that at least one intermediate conductive element (*e.g.*, bond wires 8a, 8b of FIG. 9) protrudes above the active surface of one of the semiconductor devices 2, 3.

Claim 33 is additionally allowable because Nakanishi teach or suggest that the polyimide spacer 24 thereof comprises a pattern.

Nakanishi in View of Smith

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for reciting subject matter which is assertedly unpatentable over that taught in Nakanishi, in view of teachings from U.S. Patent 6,049,370 to Smith, Jr. et al. (hereinafter “Smith”).

Claims 11 and 12 are allowable, among other reasons, for depending from claim 1, which is allowable.

Nakanishi in View of Blanton

Claims 18 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for reciting subject matter which is allegedly unpatentable over the subject matter taught in Nakanishi, in view of teachings from U.S. Patent 5,220,200 to Blanton (hereinafter “Blanton”).

Claim 18 is allowable, among other reasons, for depending from claim 1, which is allowable.

Claim 31 is allowable, among other reasons, for depending from claim 19, which is allowable.

Nakanishi in View of Mueller

Claims 11, 13, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for being directed to subject matter that is purportedly not patentable over the subject matter taught in Nakanishi, in view of the teachings of U.S. Patent 6,316,786 to Mueller et al. (hereinafter “Mueller”).

Claims 11 and 13 are both allowable, among other reasons, for depending directly from claim 1, which is allowable.

Claim 32 is allowable, among other reasons, for depending directly from claim 19, which is allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 1-13, 17-26, 31-33, 37-39, and 42-44 be withdrawn.

ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

Independent claim 1 remains generic to all of the species of invention that were identified in the Election of Species Requirement in the above-referenced application. In view of the allowability of these claims, claims 14-16, 27-30, 34-36, 41, and 45-67, which have been withdrawn from consideration, should also be considered and allowed. M.P.E.P. § 806.04(d).

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that each of claims 1-13, 17-26, 31-33, 37-39, and 42-44 is allowable. An early notice of the allowability of each of these claims is respectfully solicited, as is an indication that the above-referenced application has been passed for issuance. If any issues preventing allowance of the above-referenced application remain which might be resolved by way of a telephone conference, the Office is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Brick G. Power
Registration No. 38,581
Attorney for Applicant
TRASKBRITT, PC
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: January 23, 2006

BGP/djp:eg

Document in ProLaw